

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 225-281 were pending. No claims have been amended, canceled, or added. Thus, claims 225 – 281 remain pending and subject to examination.

Claims 225 – 281 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent No. 532,920 to Hartrick et al. (“Hartrick”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,796,220 to Wolfe (“Wolfe”). Applicants traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 225 recites, among other features, receiving, via a processor of a library unit, a request for an electronic book from an electronic book ordering site, wherein the library unit has an identification (library ID), and wherein the electronic book ordering site includes an electronic book viewer that has a viewer identification (electronic book viewer ID); requesting the electronic book from an operation center; upon a determination that a status of an account associated with the electronic book viewer is current, determining that the electronic book viewer is an authorized viewer; transmitting a data signal and a local authorization code from the operation center to the library unit, wherein the data signal comprises an encrypted content of the requested electronic book, and at least two unique ID numbers, wherein one of the at least two unique ID numbers matches the library ID and another of the at least two unique ID numbers matches the electronic book viewer ID, wherein the local authorization code is used to decrypt the encrypted content of the requested electronic book; receiving, at the library unit, the data signal and the local authorization code; storing the received authorization

code; transmitting the data signal and the local authorization code to the electronic book viewer, and at the electronic book viewer, decrypting the encrypted content of the electronic book using the local authorization code; displaying pages of the electronic book; storing the electronic book in a memory, and controlling viewing of the electronic book via a control panel of the electronic book viewer, wherein the electronic viewer is separate from the library unit and communicates with library unit via a wired or wireless interface. Claims 239-241, 243-244, 247-248, 261, 263-264, 268, and 280-281 include similar features. At least this combination of features is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination with each other.

Hartrick appears to be directed to a method of including royalty payment information with a softcopy book (see, e.g., Abstract). The Examiner cites column 12, lines 20 – 33 of Hartrick as allegedly disclosing various claim features, including “receiving, via a processor of a library unit, a request for an electronic book from an electronic book ordering site, wherein the library unit has an identification (library ID), and wherein the electronic book ordering site includes an electronic book viewer that has a viewer identification.” However, this passage merely discloses a process whereby user permission to make a copy of a book may be obtained. Hartrick, as cited, does not disclose or suggest at least the features of a library unit having a library ID or an electronic book ordering site including an electronic book viewer having a viewer identification.

The Examiner cites column 7, lines 20 – 47 of Hartrick as allegedly disclosing “transmitting a data signal and a local authorization code from the operation center to the library unit, wherein the data signal comprises an encrypted content of the

requested electronic book, and at least two unique ID numbers, wherein one of the at least two unique ID numbers matches the library ID.” The cited passage describes a display device which displays documents in WYSIWYG format. This passage has nothing to do with transmitting a data signal and a local authorization code from an operation center to a library unit, wherein data signal comprises at least two unique ID numbers, one of which matches the library ID.

The Examiner then cites column 6, lines 61 – 67 of Hartrick as allegedly disclosing “another of the at least two unique ID numbers matches the electronic book viewer ID, wherein the local authorization code is used to decrypt the encrypted content of the requested electronic book.” However, this passage merely discloses that a user’s workstation is connected over a network to a publisher’s data processor. Hartrick, as cited, does not disclose or suggest at least the features of a unique ID matching an electronic book viewer ID or a local authorization code used to decrypt encrypted content.

The Examiner correctly acknowledges that Hartrick does not disclose “receiving, at the library unit, the data signal and the local authorization code; storing the received authorization code; and transmitting the data signal and the local authorization code to the electronic book viewer,” and relies on Wolfe to overcome these deficiencies. However, even if Wolfe did disclose these features as asserted by the Examiner (though Applicants do not admit that such a disclosure is present), Wolfe does not overcome the deficiencies of Hartrick as described above. Thus, neither Hartrick nor Wolfe, alone or in combination with each other, disclose or suggest each and every feature of the independent claims, and these claims are patentable over the cited

references. Each dependent claim depends from one of the independent claims. Thus, the dependent claims are also patentable over the cited references at least by virtue of their dependency as well as the individual features each claim recites.

Based on the above, the currently pending Claims 225-303 are allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of all the pending claims, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a), and any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300 referencing docket number **026880.00024**.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Demetria A. Buncum", written over a horizontal line.

Demetria A. Buncum
Registration No. 58,848

Customer No. 004372

Arent Fox LLP
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-0605
Facsimile No. (202) 638-4810
Fax: (202) 638-4810